

F

835

K735

SMITH

PLEA

FOR THE

GOLDEN RULE

BANCROFT

The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A Plea for the Golden Rule

By Elbert A. Smith

Whatever ye would that men should do
to you, do ye even so to them.—Moses

A Plea for the Golden Rule

By Elbert A. Smith.

A review of certain portions of the book entitled
Mormonism, the Islam of America, by
Reverend Bruce Kinney.

HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
LAMONI, IOWA
1913.

Preliminary Questions

Are you courageous enough to hear both sides of a question that the Council of Women for Home Missions has thought worthy of study?

Are you willing to concede that no just conclusions can be reached until both sides are heard?

Are you sufficiently broad-minded to include all people in the scope of your application of the Golden Rule of our Savior and Lord,—not excepting even Latter Day Saints?

Are you willing to cast aside and repudiate the old spirit of bigotry that led the Jews to condemn Jesus unheard on the ground that no good could come out of despised Nazareth?

If you can answer these questions affirmatively, we beg of you to read the following pages. If you can not answer them affirmatively, there is all the more need that you should read them and heed also the divine injunction, "Ye must be born again."

CHAPTER ONE

Before we indulge in any adverse criticisms upon this book we must thank the author, Reverend Bruce Kinney, for a statement made in the preface regarding the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. He says:

Nothing that may be said in this book must be taken as *necessarily* applying to the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, having headquarters at Lamoni, Iowa. The official name of the Utah Church does not have the word "*Reorganized.*" The Iowa Church claims to be the true church, asserts that after the death of Joseph Smith the control should have passed to his son and namesake, now their head, and that Brigham Young usurped authority and corrupted the practices and doctrines of the church. The Iowa adherents of Joseph Smith are called "Josephites" by their Utah brethren and they, in turn, hurl the epithet "Brighamites" at the Utah Church.

The Iowa Church accepts the Book of Mormon and some of the Doctrine and Covenants, but repudiates polygamy. To further set forth their differences is not within the scope of this work. It may be said, however, that the Josephites are a law-abiding body of American citizens and that there is no direct descendant of the original prophet in the fellowship of the Utah Church, the present president of that church, Joseph F. Smith, being a nephew of Joseph Smith, jr.—Mormonism, the Islam of America, Preface, p. 10.

Mr. Kinney should have credit for making this very fair statement regarding our position.

WHY DO WE REVIEW THIS BOOK?

This distinction having been made so clearly at the very beginning, we may be asked why we con-

cern ourselves with the book at all. To this we reply that it is not our intention to make any attack upon those portions of the work which are devoted to Utah Mormonism (mainly included in chapters 3 to 6, inclusive). But the first two chapters are devoted to Joseph Smith, the Book of Mormon, and the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints prior to the rise of Utah Mormonism. With these chapters we are more concerned than any other people. The civil courts have twice decided that the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is the true successor to and continuation of the church founded by Joseph Smith, and continued under his administration until his death, in 1844. (See decision by Judge L. S. Sherman, Court of Common Pleas, Lake County, Ohio, 1880; also decision of Judge John F. Philips, Circuit Court of the United States, Western District of Missouri, Western Division, 1894.)

The first of these decisions in part reads:

That the church in Utah, the Defendant, of which John Taylor is president, has materially and largely departed from the faith, doctrines, laws, ordinances and usages of said original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and has incorporated into its system of faith the doctrines of celestial marriage and plurality of wives, and the doctrine of Adam-god worship, contrary to the laws and constitution of said original church.

And the Court do further find that the Plaintiff, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, is the true and lawful continuation of, and successor to the said original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, organized in 1830, and is entitled in law to all its rights and property.

In the light of these two decisions, which are based

on the law and the facts in the case, it will be seen that any attack upon the character of Joseph Smith or the church organized by him is a matter of concern to us, to say the least. Though we may assist good Christian people everywhere in every legitimate effort to extirpate polygamy and other evils of Utah Mormonism, we can not join with them in an attack upon Joseph Smith and a people who were in no way responsible for these evils. We trust that this is perfectly clear, and that no one will be so heavy-witted as to imagine that our challenge of the first two chapters of this book in any way allies us with Utah Mormonism.

We are prepared to defend the teachings and doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (when those teachings and doctrines are correctly stated), from its organization until the death of Joseph Smith in 1844, and the teachings and doctrines of the Reorganization from its beginning until now. But we have no defense to make of the record and teachings of that body of people led by Brigham Young to Utah; nor of the so-called revelation sanctioning polygamy by them interpolated in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, believing it to be contrary to all the teachings of the early church and contrary to the precepts of the Bible, Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants.

THE SIN OF POVERTY AND THE CRIME OF VISIONS.

Mr. Kinney says that he lays no claim to originality, excepting in arrangement of material. That statement is rendered somewhat unnecessary by the fact that he begins the first chapter of his book by

saying of Joseph Smith: "His parents and relatives were all poor, ne'er-do-well visionaries, guided by dreams, seeking hidden treasures and often in conflict with the officers of the law."

This has been the stereotyped approach to this subject by the opposition for so long that we would have felt startled and disturbed had he begun in some other way.

So Joseph Smith's parents and relatives were poor! Well, it is no crime to have poor relations; if it were, the jails would all be full. How much money must one have before he would be eligible to become a prophet of God, or the father of a prophet?

But they had trouble with the officers of the law! So did Paul and Silas. So did John Wesley. So did Roger Williams, one of the patron saints of Mr. Kinney's own denomination. Why did Mr. Kinney fail to mention even one crime of which they were convicted, citing us to the charges and findings of the court?

They were believers in inspired dreams and visions! Witness Joseph and Mary driven from the Holy Land to inhospitable Egypt,—by a dream! Witness the boy Samuel disturbed by night by a vision! Review the sacred history of the past and name the men and women of godliness who were not visionaries and dreamers.

Evidently Mr. Kinney does not believe in dreams. The poet says: "When dreams depart, then it is time to die."

GOD MAY SPEAK, SAYS MR. KINNEY.

While we are on this line of thought we must

thank Mr. Kinney for another admission (found on page 48 of his work) where he says:

God may reveal himself to any man, woman or child, but that he would choose such a man as we know Smith all his life to be his "vicegerent on earth" we can not for a moment believe.

This admission that "God may reveal himself to any man, woman, or child," is a recession from the position strenuously maintained by the colleagues of Mr. Kinney for the past eighty years or more, that the day of revelation is past. We have been told by the clergy of nearly all denominations that revelation ceased with John on Patmos. This admission comes as a grateful change. Our contention that there may be prophets in the church, and that inspired dreams, visions, and revelations may be received at any time, is practically conceded. Instead of being told, as formerly, that it is *impossible* that Joseph Smith should have received the revelations that he claimed to receive, because God does not give revelations in this age, we are now told that it is quite possible for any man, woman, or child to receive revelation, but not *probable* that Joseph Smith received any, because of his character.

Now this objection can be removed, for we can produce witnesses who knew Joseph Smith well and who testify that his character was most excellent. This at least balances the testimony of those who affirm that he was a bad man; and in such a situation wisdom directs that we should turn from the testimony of bigoted enemies and partisan friends and examine the revelations that he claimed to receive, judging them on their merits. This would be the

safest course to pursue, not trusting the statements of intolerant enemies, for the Right Reverend Bishop Spalding, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, says:

Those who attacked the Mormons felt moved to publish everything they could discover *or invent* to the discredit of "Joe Smith" and his parents.—Joseph Smith, Jr., as a Translator, p. 4.

Mr. Kinney, in fact, does make an effort to examine some of these revelations, and the straits to which he is driven in his effort to find something damnable in them is illustrated in a startling and spectacular manner, as we shall show by three examples.

EXAMPLE NUMBER ONE.

On page 18 of his book he says:

Smith soon received a revelation in which the Lord was reported as saying, "I will consecrate the riches of the Gentiles unto my people" (Doctrine and Covenants 42). It is said that this was so liberally interpreted by his people that they were soon in disrepute among their neighbors, and in 1832 Smith and his associate, Rigdon, were tarred and feathered by a mob.

We might imagine that this garbled version of the revelation in question was based on a rendition supposed to be found in the Book of Commandments (a book which the Saints attempted to publish in Missouri, their work being interrupted by the mob that destroyed their publishing house. The work, so far as carried out, contained many typographical errors and was never indorsed by the church.) But we may not indulge this supposition, because Mr. Kinney himself cites us to Doctrine and Covenants, section 42, which shows that he knew the accepted and ac-

credited version and indicates that he had it before him at the time. If not before him, it certainly should have been in the preparation of a textbook of this kind, in which truth and accuracy should be found, and in the preparation of which the golden rule should govern.

Now note the true rendition of this commandment: "I will consecrate of the riches of *those who embrace my gospel among the Gentiles, unto the poor of my people who are of the house of Israel.*"—Doctrine and Covenants 42: 11.

WHY DID MR. KINNEY OMIT THESE WORDS?

We have italicized certain of the words *omitted* by Mr. Kinney. These words explain that this is to be a consecration made by those who voluntarily *accept the gospel and unite with the church*; and it is to be for the *aid of the poor and needy*, a most worthy work, and quite in line with the teachings of Jesus, as well as with the policy of certain good Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, who *since the day of Joseph Smith* have awakened to the necessity of paying tithing regularly into the church coffers for charitable purposes.

Joseph Smith himself explained it clearly:

Now for a man to consecrate his property, his wife and children to the Lord is nothing more nor less than to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the widows and fatherless, the sick and afflicted; and do all he can to administer to their relief in their afflictions, and for himself and his house to serve the Lord. In order to do this he and all his house must be virtuous and "shun the appearance of evil." Now if any person has represented anything *otherwise* than we now write *they have willfully misrepresented us.*—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 1, p. 85.

Now this was the teaching of that awful man, "the worst of the lot,"—for which he was tarred and feathered.

Possibly it was a fine thing that he had been poor in his youth. He seemed to have developed sympathy for the poor, who were so close to the heart of Jesus.

Now we press the query: *Why* did Mr. Kinney omit those explanatory words from his quotation, thus transforming a very innocent and commendable statement into something dark and damnable? The reader may judge.

BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES USE TAR AND FEATHERS.

Right here we wish to remind Mr. Kinney that the *Columbian Encyclopedia* says: "1832, March 22d, a mob of Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, and miscellaneous zealots broke into the prophet's house, tore him from his wife's arms, . . . and tarred and feathered him."

While the historian, Hubert H. Bancroft, says: "On the night of the 25th of March, Smith and Rigdon were seized by a mob, composed partly of the Campbellites, Methodists, and Baptists of Hiram. . . . The captives were roughly treated, and expected to be killed; but after they had been stripped, beaten, and well covered with tar and feathers, they were released."—*History of Utah*, p. 90.

It is not a matter of surprise that Mr. Kinney should seek to palliate the conduct of his fellow Baptists on that occasion, and that others should smile at the work of their fellow "Campbellites" or Disciples; but when the facts are all known, of all the people involved in that dastardly act, the Saints have least cause for shame, and our friends of these

popular churches should be last to mention the affair. This is but one of many instances showing who the lawbreakers were in those days.

EXAMPLE NUMBER TWO.

On pages 56 and 57 Mr. Kinney considers the testimony of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon. He attempts to prove that the eight witnesses were granted privileges that the Lord had previously said should be given to the three *and to none else*. He attempts to make it appear that the Lord had said that no one but the three should *see* the plates, asking if it is possible that the Lord had "forgotten that he said, when he showed the plates to the 'Three,' that no one else in that generation should *see* them?" He cites the reader to Doctrine and Covenants 5. No such statement appears in section 5; but it does appear that the Lord said that to none else would be given power to receive "this same testimony." While the eight *saw* the plates, they did not *receive the same testimony*, for the three testify that an angel appeared unto them bearing the plates, and that the voice of the Lord commanded them to testify. The eight bore no such testimony, nor anything like it. Many people *saw* Jesus; but to only a few, comparatively, was the peculiar *testimony* given that Peter bore (see Matthew 16: 16).

WHY DID MR. KINNEY DO THIS?

But here comes the most damaging feature of all. Mr. Kinney says:

The "Eight" in their testimony say:

We have seen the plates which contain this record, . . . and we also testify that we have seen the engravings which

are upon the plates; and they have been shown to us *by the power of God* . . . an angel came down from heaven and he brought and laid before our eyes and it is by the grace of God that we beheld and saw the plates.

Here he has taken language found *only* in the testimony of the "three" and ascribes it to the "eight" in an effort to prove that the "eight" received something that the Lord had previously said none but the "three" should receive, thus discrediting the revelations. The testimonies of the witnesses are found in the front of every copy of the Book of Mormon, and anyone who cares to do so can verify our statement and see for themselves what Mr. Kinney did.

Why did Mr. Kinney do this? Is it necessary to do these things in order to find flaws in the revelations? Are there no evils there that can be pointed out in the text *as it stands*, without garbling and twisting?

If this is simply carelessness, as we prefer to think of it, of what value is the book as a textbook for the study of church societies? If there were any ulterior motive back of it, which we would not suppose to be the case with a member of the Baptist clergy, the situation would be even worse.

Are such methods fair? Does this accord with the indorsement of the Editorial Committee of the Council of Women for Home Missions? They say on page 7 of this book: "Doctor Kinney's point of view is intelligent, broad, and just."

EXAMPLE NUMBER THREE.

On page 63 Mr. Kinney says:

There is a long prophecy (pp. 65-67) in reference to Joseph Smith in which it is said that he was to be a descendant

in direct line of the elder Joseph through Lehi. Now the account further says that all the Nephites were destroyed and only Lamanites (Indians) were left upon this hemisphere. Therefore Smith must have been an Indian, but his mother tells us that he was descended from one Robert Smith who lived in England three hundred years ago. It will not do to say that he was the "spiritual" seed of Lehi, for in the prophecy the expression "fruit of thy loins" is used too often in referring to Joseph.

The descendants of Joseph of Egypt through Ephraim and Manasseh were to be scattered among the nations, becoming a "multitude of nations," and a "multitude of people," as the Bible assures us. It would not be impossible or even improbable that Joseph Smith's lineage might run back to this man, even though his immediate ancestors may have lived in England.

But in order to make a *case* Mr. Kinney inserts the clause, "*through Lehi*," dragging in a proposition that does not appear anywhere in the Book of Mormon. It is not stated anywhere in the book that this descent was to be *through Lehi*, neither did Joseph Smith to our knowledge ever make such a claim.

Are errors so scarce in the Book of Mormon that it is necessary for critics to manufacture them? Why pass by the absurdities which he says abound, and settle upon one of his own making? Is this another example of carelessness? The reader may decide.

We have selected three instances which demonstrate beyond a doubt that this book, so far as the first two chapters are concerned, is not a reliable textbook. However accurate Mr. Kinney's personal observations may be upon conditions existing in Utah, as set forth in chapters three to six, inclusive,

his book is not reliable as a textbook on the work and teachings of Joseph Smith and the early church prior to 1844.

CHAPTER TWO

Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.—Jesus.

Before beginning this review we wrote to Mr. Kinney, calling his attention to certain matters that we intended to mention. Our letter follows:

LAMONI, IOWA, May 15, 1913.

REVEREND BRUCE KINNEY,
TOPEKA, KANSAS.

Dear Sir: A correspondent of the SAINTS' HERALD mentions two matters set forth in your book entitled, *Mormonism, the Islam of America*, concerning which we have thought it best to write you personally. On page fifty-seven of your book you quote language which purports to be taken from the testimony of the eight witnesses of the Book of Mormon. This is used to indicate that the Lord gave to the *eight* witnesses a testimony which he had previously said should only be received by the *three witnesses*. The facts are that the language which you ascribe to the *eight* you have taken from the testimony of the *three*, as anyone can see by referring to the testimony found in every copy of the Book of Mormon. The correspondent charges that this indicates either gross carelessness upon your part, or downright dishonesty. But before commenting at any length upon this in our publication, we thought it only just to write to you personally and hear any explanation that you might wish to make regarding the matter.

Again, on page eighteen of your book, you say, "Smith

soon received a revelation in which the Lord was reported as saying, 'I will consecrate the riches of the Gentiles unto my people.'" You cite the reader to Doctrine and Covenants, section 42. The language as found in the Doctrine and Covenants, section 42 reads: "I will consecrate of the riches of *those who embrace my gospel*, among the Gentiles, *unto the poor* of my people who are of the house of Israel." From this it will be seen that the consecration of money was to be made only by those who were converted from among the Gentiles, and voluntarily gave of their riches for the support of the poor and needy. Your omission of the explanatory words could hardly have been accidental, but as in the former case we have thought best to write personally before commenting at length in the HERALD.

We shall be glad to hear any statement that you may wish to make regarding the matter. If the work founded by Joseph Smith was a fraud, as you contend, you, yourself, would hardly care to be placed in the attitude of combating it by dishonest and contemptible methods.

Sincerely yours,

ELBERT A. SMITH.

To this Mr. Kinney replied as follows:

TOPEKA, KANSAS, May 21, 1913.

ELBERT A. SMITH,

LAMONI, IOWA.

My Dear Sir: Yours of the 15th at hand and would have received earlier attention except for the fact that I am just recovering from a serious illness of several weeks. I have not the time or strength to look up the matter to which you refer, as my books of reference just now are not convenient. After all, it does not seem to me to make much difference as far as the essential point is concerned, as to whether the "8" or the "3" uses that expression, and I fail to see also any essential difference when the language is carefully examined in your alleged correction of my quotation of section 42 of the Doctrine and Covenants.

Your letter is very courteous, but I wish to say that I have received several letters from your people that were anything but courteous, some of which made threats, which

if I cared to push in the United States courts might get them into trouble for violation of law, but I don't care for anything of this nature, and I shall absolutely decline to enter into a discussion public or private with you or any of your representatives on this topic. It does not bother me what you do or don't do. If you will carefully read at the top of page 10 in the preface of my book you will notice what I say. "Nothing that I say in this book must be taken as *necessarily* applying to the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, having headquarters at Lamoni, Iowa." I lived too long at Plano, Illinois, not to know something about your people, some of them are my personal friends, though we radically disagree as to our beliefs; that is my right as well as theirs. Your people have always maintained that you are not at all in sympathy with the Utah Church. I am in a position to know that there is a feeling in the minds of some of those who are the closest students of the Mormon situation that there is some kind of a secret alliance of understanding between your church and the Utah Church. I have always denied this. If you people can not ignore some trivial things which you do not like in my book for example; and if you can not make common cause with us against the Utah hierarchy you will convince many and myself among the rest that you are in secret collusion with the Utah Church, and have the same motive as they have. If you will adopt this policy and ignore some of these things upon which we disagree no one will know that anything in this book does apply to your people. If you make a "big noise" the people will know and you will attract unfavorable attention to yourself.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE KINNEY.

MR. KINNEY'S LETTER EXAMINED.

We will comment briefly upon four points suggested in the letter from Mr. Kinney.

Regarding the threatening and abusive letters which Mr. Kinney says he has received from some of our people: Frankly, we do not believe that any

of our representative men have been writing to Mr. Kinney in a threatening and abusive manner. Probably these letters came from irresponsible persons. We have written Mr. Kinney, requesting him to give us the names of those who have written to him in this manner. Our people should ever be courteous in their treatment of others, as becomes those who profess to be followers of Jesus.

BLINDNESS HATH HAPPENED IN PART TO MR. KINNEY.

We wrote to Mr. Kinney calling his attention to the fact that in his book a professed quotation from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants was published, vital parts of the quotation being omitted in such a way as to transform an entirely innocent commandment or statement into one that might be considered very damaging, and very offensive to honest people, if not understood, and to the further fact that in order to make a point which did not in reality exist, language was taken from the testimony of the *three* witnesses to the Book of Mormon, and was ascribed to the *eight*,

We wished to give Mr. Kinney an opportunity to defend his course in this matter if it was intentional, or to acknowledge an error if his conduct was the result of a mistake. His explanation is before the reader. We do not care to make any comment. Nothing that we would have the heart to say would be more damaging than his own statement that he does not see that it *makes any difference*.

Is this according to the golden rule?

NO SECRET ALLIANCE.

Regarding the statement in his letter that some believe that there exists a secret alliance or understanding between the Utah Church and the Reorganized Church: Mr. Kinney, from his experience with our people in Plano and later with the Mormons in Utah, knows very well that such an alliance does not exist. Yet he professes to be ready to conclude that it does exist if we venture to refute any statements made in his book reflecting upon the character and work of Joseph Smith and the early church. Because we are in sympathy with legitimate efforts to extirpate polygamy and kindred evils in Utah, must we remain silent when an attack is made upon the character of Joseph Smith, who, as we believe, was in no way responsible for those evils, and upon the Book of Mormon, which we accept as a revelation from God?

We believe that Mr. Kinney, upon mature reflection, will readily conclude that our defense of the Book of Mormon and the mission of Joseph Smith in no way compromises us with Utah Mormonism, in view of the fact previously cited that the courts have twice decided that Utah Mormonism is *not* a legitimate outgrowth of the church founded by Joseph Smith.

Mr. Kinney thinks that we should make common cause with other churches against the Utah hierarchy. This we are willing to do, so long as legitimate methods are used, either to curb and restrain the teaching and practice of polygamy, or to convert members of the Utah Church to something higher

and better. Our works in that regard are our best defense.

OUR PEOPLE PIONEERS IN UTAH MISSION WORK.

Mr. Kinney tells about the hardships endured by the missionaries of his church (the Baptist Church) and other denominations in early days when they established missions in Utah. The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was the *pioneer* in this work, and he can not tell us anything about the trials and hardships of those early days when fearless men went into Utah, prepared to defy the power of Brigham Young, and to denounce polygamy in its stronghold.

We first established our mission there in 1863, when Elder E. C. Briggs opened up the work in Utah. This was *eighteen years* before the Baptist Church established its mission, according to the date given by Mr. Kinney (page 173). Other churches, according to his figures, opened their missions in the following order: Congregational Church, 1864; Protestant Episcopal, 1867; Methodist Episcopal, 1870; Presbyterian, 1871.

During the years of our mission work there we have probably made more converts than any other one denomination. And whereas Mr. Kinney complains that many of the converts from Mormonism made by the other churches return to their former faith, we have had very little trouble in that regard, as most, if not all of our conversions have been permanent.

WILL NOT DISCUSS THE QUESTION.

We notice that he says, "I shall absolutely decline to enter into a discussion public or private with you or any of your representatives on this topic."

We had no thought of drawing Mr. Kinney into a debate. His decision in that matter does credit to his discretion. It may not appear courageous, but it is discreet.

So much for Mr. Kinney's letter. Frankly we do not believe that he intended to be dishonest in his treatment of the subject, but prefer to think that he passed over the matter carelessly, as many others have done, and instead of giving careful research to original textbooks of the faith, he accepted the statements of sensational writers who had preceded him and were thoroughly dishonest and unfair in their treatment of the the subject.

So, however accurate his personal observations in Utah may be, as set forth in chapters three to six, inclusive, his digest of the early history of the church and its teachings is utterly unreliable.

CRITICISMS OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

On page sixty-two of his work Mr. Kinney says, "The accounts of alleged miracles given in the Book of Mormon are puerile in the extreme."

Mr. Kinney is making exactly the same criticism of the Book of Mormon that Ingersoll made of the Bible. In one of his lectures, Mr. Ingersoll said:

There must be a mistake somewhere or somehow. Do you believe the real God—if there is one—ever killed a man for making hair-oil. And yet you find in the pentateuch that God gave Moses a recipe for making hair-oil to grease Aaron's

beard; and said if anybody made the same hair-oil he should be killed. And he gave him a formula for making ointment, and he said if anybody made ointment like that he should be killed. I think that is carrying patent laws to excess. There must be some mistake about it. I can not imagine the infinite creator of all the shining worlds giving a recipe for hair-oil. Do you believe that the real God came down to Mount Sinai with a lot of patterns for making a tabernacle—patterns for tongs, for snuffers and such things. Do you believe God came down on that mountain and told Moses how to cut a coat, and how it should be trimmed?—Colonel R. G. Ingersoll, Forty-four Lectures Complete.

Concerning the Bible Mr. Ingersoll was an infidel. Concerning the Book of Mormon, Mr. Kinney is an infidel; and possibly if he were questioned closely regarding some of the miracles recorded in the Bible, he would not be found very sound in the faith in that particular. In any event he is as unjust and as wide of the mark in his criticism of the Book of Mormon as Ingersoll was in his similar criticism of the Bible. The fact is that most of the stock arguments used against the Book of Mormon are borrowed from infidels who first used them against the Bible.

On page sixty he says: "Whoever was the author of this book had various pet words and expressions which are used over and over again in spite of the absurdity."

This may be true regarding *some parts* of the Book of Mormon, concerning *others* it is untrue. It is equally true concerning some parts of the Bible, as infidels affirm; for instance, read this:

And if they be ashamed of all that they have done, show them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the

forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the laws thereof, and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and do them.—Ezekiel 43: 11.

In neither instance is the inspiration of the book destroyed by the fact that some of the writers were not polished in their style.

He says concerning the Book of Mormon: "Everything is stilted, complicated, diffuse, meaningless or even brutal." To refute this one has but to read the following language from the Book of Mormon:

Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none: For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women.

Does Mr. Kinney find this stilted, complicated, diffuse, meaningless, or brutal? These "brutal" statements are our bulwark against the polygamy of Utah and the concubinage of other places.

DOES MR. KINNEY KNOW WHAT A "TRANSLATION" IS?

Mr. Kinney says that the Book of Mormon puts "modern words, expressions, and idioms," into the mouths of crude savages who lived two thousand five hundred years ago.

Mr. Kinney should know that the Book of Mormon is a TRANSLATION and does not put a single modern word or expression into the mouth of anyone who lived two thousand five hundred years ago. Those people spoke a language of their own; the Book of Mormon renders in English the ideas that they expressed in their language. The book was translated into a modern language and used modern words and expressions, which was only natural and proper.

As well might Mr. Kinney, with childlike ignorance, say that the Revised Version of the Bible puts modern English into the mouths of Paul the Hebrew, Pilate the Roman, or even into the mouths of Moses and Aaron, and the Egyptian Pharaoh. It is astonishing that such a criticism should emanate from a sane man.

DID ANCIENT AMERICANS USE IRON?

Mr. Kinney says that there is no evidence that the aborigines of this country knew about iron and steel, whereas the Book of Mormon says that they worked in iron, brass, steel, and gold and silver, during at least one period of their development.

A. J. Conant, A. M., author of *Footprints of Vanished Races in the Mississippi Valley*, says:

And to the question whether they possessed a knowledge of working iron, the *wise man* will hesitate a long time before he answers in the negative.

It is significant that Mr. Kinney did not hesitate. He evidently thinks that the immense temples and stone buildings of ancient Mexico and Central America were erected and carved and ornamented with inscriptions done in the solid rock with the aid of stone and wooden or bone implements.

But Mr. Cyrus Thomas, author of *American Archæology*, and for twenty-nine years connected with the Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, reports finding iron implements of undisputed antiquity in both United States and Mexico; also articles of gold. He completely spoils Mr. Kinney's theory by declaring that it must be ad-

mitted that these ancient people had “discovered the art of casting metal in molds.”

UNSUPPORTED CHARGES.

Many serious charges are made against the members and founders of the church during the early days of its history; but no evidence is cited to support these charges, and no reliable witnesses are brought forward, nor the findings of any court shown, so we will not examine these charges in detail. How easy it is to make charges of a very damaging nature based on *rumor* and the assertions of *enemies*, and how flat the same charges may fall when *both sides* are heard and accurate and reliable evidence is demanded.

EVIL STORIES BORN OF RELIGIOUS HATRED.

The old stories circulated against the character of Latter Day Saints in an early day (though some of them are set forth in great detail as coming from men who knew) in reality had their origin in *religious hatred* and *neighborhood scandal*. All people should know the unreliable character of neighborhood gossip, especially when it is tinged with denominational bigotry. One encyclopedia gravely says of Joseph Smith:

There is the most SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE—THAT OF HIS ENEMIES.

Every religious reformer has suffered from this thing. Men who claimed to know swore that the good John Wesley was a scoundrel, a pickpocket, a traitor, and that he had been convicted of selling gin. We read: “In London also, the Methodists were

exposed to persecution and the fury of an enraged and bestial population." (See History of Methodist Episcopal Church, by Reverend P. Douglass Gorrie.)

This has been the experience of nearly every religious agitator, and Joseph Smith was no exception, —only now our good friends of the clergy are not willing to let these stories die. Why not? Why not begin to treat Latter Day Saints according to the golden rule that Christians profess to honor?

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY.

How different the stories told by men who were fair-minded and who knew.

The Honorable George Edmunds, one of the best known lawyers of western Illinois, an honored man in the community where the Saints, under Joseph Smith, had headquarters, at Nauvoo, says:

I can say for the Mormon population, so far as I knew them, that I think I never knew so **INDUSTRIOUS, FRUGAL, AND VIRTUOUS** a set of people as they were.—The Mormon Settlement in Illinois, an Address by Senator O. F. Berry before the Illinois State Historical Society, p. 11.

Robert Lucas, governor of Ohio from 1832 to 1836, during the stay of the Saints at Kirtland, and governor of Iowa at the time of the settlement at Nauvoo, wrote to President Van Buren under date of April 22, 1839, saying:

I think it is due to that people to state, that they had for a number of years a community established in Ohio, and that while in that State they were (as far as I ever heard) believed to be an **INDUSTRIOUS, INOFFENSIVE** people; and I have no recollection of having ever heard of **ANY OF THEM** being charged in that State as violators of the law.

The Columbian Encyclopedia (1897) says of the Saints in Missouri:

Everywhere was visible a spirit of industry, sobriety, order, and cleanliness. It is only fair to the Mormons to state these things.

It is true that the Kirtland Bank failed. But it was started with good motives, and was only one of hundreds of similar institutions to fail during the great panic. At a later date the church sent an agent back to Kirtland to settle with all creditors so far as possible. Our detractors, however, never mention that fact.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SPALDING ROMANCE THEORY.

"A very pretty 'theory,' and somewhat ingenious, but where is the evidence to support it?"—D. H. Bays.

"Barring the question of the hearsay character of the evidence, I believe that a case can be made out much stronger than the circumstantial evidence upon which many a man has been hung."—A. T. Schroeder.

"This may be true, but it must be borne in mind that many an innocent man has been hung upon purely 'circumstantial evidence.' . . . I need not remind an experienced attorney that there is a vast difference between 'hearsay evidence' and 'circumstantial evidence.' . . . The former Greenleaf peremptorily excludes." . . .—D. H. Bays.

In his effort to explain the book of Mormon, Mr. Kinney has recourse to the old Spalding romance theory. He is aware of the existence of the famous

Solomon Spalding manuscript in Oberlin College, and the fact that it bears no resemblance to the Book of Mormon; but being unwilling to abandon the old, worn-out theory, he concludes that there was a *second* manuscript, an imaginary, enlarged revision of the first, which has never been discovered, and which served as a basis for the Book of Mormon. In this idea he joins a few others who have tried to make it appear that there were two or even three of these Spalding manuscripts, and who probably would enlarge that number indefinitely, if necessary to bolster up their cause.

Briefly stated, the Spalding theory is to the effect that Solomon Spalding, who died in 1816, wrote a story about 1811, which he submitted to a publisher in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, some time prior to the close of 1814, and that Sidney Rigdon either stole or copied this manuscript, or that Joseph Smith stole or copied it after it passed from the hands of the publisher, according to the fancy of the one defending the theory, imagination not being hampered by facts or rules of evidence in this matter. (The widow of Spalding, who is put forward as a leading witness, says the manuscript was *copied* by Rigdon, and the *original* came back into her possession and was later given by her to Doctor Hurlbut—see Smucker's History of the Mormons.) The theory then runs to the effect that from this manuscript the Book of Mormon was concocted.

ORIGIN OF THIS CANARD.

The Spalding theory was first exploited in 1834, in a book entitled Mormonism Unveiled, by E. D.

Howe. Howe was a "Mormon hater" and was assisted in his work by Doctor Hurlbut, who was seeking revenge for having been excommunicated from the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints for indecent conduct. (See Church History, vol. 1, p. 294.)

Hurlbut at the time was so vindictive that it was necessary for the civil courts to put him under bonds to prevent him wounding or killing Joseph Smith. (See court records of Court of Common Pleas, Chardon, Geauga County, Ohio, 1834.) A murderer at heart, foiled in his purpose to do physical injury, he found no means too foul for his use in assassinating character. Yet the results of his work are implicitly accepted by many writers of to-day.

Doctor Hurlbut secured the Spalding manuscript from the widow of Reverend Spalding and turned it over to Howe, as is shown by his testimony and the testimony of the widow. But Howe did not see fit to publish it, although to have done so would have been the surest way to have exposed the fraud, *providing, of course, that his theory was correct*. The fact that he *did not do so* was fatal evidence of the weakness of his position.

Instead of publishing the manuscript he contented himself with publishing affidavits from John Spalding (a brother of Solomon Spalding), Martha Spalding (John's wife), Henry Lake, John Miller, Aaron Wright, Oliver Smith, and one or two others who testified that they had heard the Spalding romance read and later heard the Book of Mormon read and discovered a striking resemblance between the two.

THE "MANUSCRIPT FOUND" COMES TO LIGHT.

For many years the Spalding manuscript was lost sight of; but in 1885; Mr. L. L. Rice, who over forty years previously had purchased the *Painesville Telegraph* from E. D. Howe, and had transferred the printing department, with type, press, and manuscripts to Honolulu, discovered this manuscript while going over old documents, in connection with his friend, President Fairchild, of Oberlin College.

They read the manuscript carefully and reached the very just conclusion that it could never have served as a basis for the Book of Mormon. The manuscript was delivered into the care of President Fairchild and was placed in the library of Oberlin College. Mr. Fairchild prepared under his own supervision an exact copy of this manuscript, which was published, and may be obtained from the Herald Publishing House, Lamoni, Iowa.

This manuscript bore the following indorsement, signed by D. P. Hurlbut:

The writings of Solomon Spalding proved by Aaron Wright, Oliver Smith, John N. Miller and others. The testimonies of the above gentlemen are now in my possession.

Mr. Kinney claims that this manuscript does not bear the title of "Manuscript Found" on the title-page. Others have made the same criticism. This is explained by the fact that Spalding's widow says that the publisher urged him to make out a title-page and he refused. But in the very introduction of his work the author says that he translated it from manuscript *found* in a cave. This at once suggests and acknowledges the name by which it was known

to the family and friends, so this trivial objection is removed.

DUBIOUS BUT "WILLING" WITNESSES.

Thus we have traced the manuscript into the possession of E. D. Howe, among whose effects it was found by L. L. Rice. When Howe came to examine the manuscript he did not publish it, giving as an excuse that it did not read *as he expected*.

How, then, do we account for the fact that relatives and friends of Reverend Solomon Spalding testified that the Book of Mormon resembled his manuscript story?

Sometimes the human memory is treacherous. We have frequently heard men and women of undoubted veracity in important cases before the courts squarely contradict their own testimony given at a preliminary hearing one year previous. A judge of one of the superior courts says that this is a common experience. It must be remembered that these men and women whose affidavits Howe used were testifying concerning a book that they had heard read more than *twenty years before they testified*. How many of our readers are competent to give accurate testimony regarding a novel that they casually heard read twenty or twenty-three years ago,—especially when there was nothing to lead them to think that they would ever be called upon to bear witness as to its character, and so did not particularly charge their minds with its contents?

They testified to the appearance of exactly similar names in both books. How easy for one who had heard Spalding's manuscript read twenty-two years

previously to imagine that the word Mormon, appearing in the Book of Mormon, was identical with Mammoons, found in the Manuscript Found, especially as some of these witnesses remembered these names by the *initial letter only*,—as they declared that Spalding made peculiar initial letters.

Again witnesses whose memory has been made hazy by the lapse of time can be very skillfully directed in their testimony, if they are properly handled by an unscrupulous attorney. These people were bitter enemies of the Saints. They hated the Book of Mormon and desired to destroy it. They were plastic witnesses. They were questioned by men who were seeking revenge and were very skillful in directing them in their testimony. This was brought out by an answer given by Mrs. McKinstry in an interview. She was asked:

When did you first think about the names in the Book of Mormon and the manuscript agreeing?

My attention was first called to it by some parties who asked me if I did not remember it, AND THEN I REMEMBERED THAT THEY WERE.—Braden-Kelley Debate, p. 82.

Thus by skillful questioning and careful direction, Hurlbut and Howe were able to get the kind of testimony that they wanted from these people who were trying to remember the contents of a manuscript that they had heard read more than twenty years before. They were obliging but unreliable witnesses. Upon such a flimsy basis does the Spalding romance theory rest.

NO MANUSCRIPT BY SPALDING COULD SERVE AS A BASIS
FOR BOOK OF MORMON.

One has but to read this manuscript to be convinced that it never served as a basis for the Book of Mormon. Nor will it do to think that any revised copy of that manuscript by the same author might have served for such a basis. The personality of an author appears in every book that he may write. Those who read this Manuscript Found will soon conclude that *no book ever written by Reverend Solomon Spalding* could possibly have served as a basis for the Book of Mormon.

Anyone with brains enough to work Solomon Spalding's writings over and produce such a book as the Book of Mormon would not have needed any help from Spalding's pen in the first instance.

MEN WHO HAVE ABANDONED THE SPALDING THEORY.

Really intelligent and careful students of the question have completely abandoned the Spalding story. David Utter is reported to have said:

No one who has ever carefully read the Book of Mormon could fail to see that it never in any part was written for a romance. . . . Now, at last, the Spalding manuscript has been found, and it rests secure in the library of Oberlin College. —The Latter Day Saints, by Kauffman, p. 29.

D. H. Bays, who studied the question for forty years, and was hailed by our Christian friends as a "child of providence," whose book, they assured us, was absolutely reliable as a textbook, says:

The long-lost Spalding story has at last been unearthed, and is now on deposit in the library of Oberlin College at Oberlin, Ohio, and may be examined by anyone who may

take the pains to call on President Fairchild, of that institution. . . .

The Spalding story is a failure. Do not attempt to rely upon it—it will let you down.

The entire theory connecting Sidney Rigdon and the Spalding romance with Joseph Smith in originating the Book of Mormon *must be abandoned*.—Doctrines and Dogmas of Mormonism, pp. 24, 25.

President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, says:

The theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon in the traditional manuscript of Solomon Spalding, will probably have to be relinquished. . . . Some other explanation of the origin of the Book of Mormon must be found, if any explanation is required.—Manuscript Found, pp. 5, 6.

And last, but not least, comes the new Encyclopedia Britannica (fourteenth edition), in which we read:

It was a contention of the early anti-Mormons, now HOWEVER DISCREDITED, that the Book of Mormon as published by Smith was rewritten with few changes from an unpublished romance, The Manuscript Found, written before 1812 by Solomon Spalding. . . . There is no actual proof that Rigdon lived in Pittsburg, or was employed in a printer's shop there as early as when Spalding's "copy" must have been left with the printer; and there is NO EVIDENCE THAT RIGDON KNEW ANYTHING OF MORMONISM UNTIL AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.—Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 18, p. 843.

D. H. BAYS ON THE IMAGINARY SECOND MANUSCRIPT.

The new fangled theory that there were two or three manuscripts is perhaps best answered by one of the ablest of our opponents, Mr. D. H. Bays, who in the *Christian Evangelist* for November 2, 1899, in reply to one A. T. Schroeder, one of his own yoke

mates, but an advocate of the "three manuscript" theory, wrote as follows:

I was, at the time my book was written, fully aware that such assertions had repeatedly been made, but as I have never been able to obtain the testimony of a SINGLE WITNESS in support of the claim, I have unhesitatingly dismissed it as an IDLE SPECULATION.

You assure me that the first of these manuscripts "simply outlined the story and is the one now in Oberlin." The second, you assert with equal gravity, "was prepared for the printer," while in the third "the plot of the story changed as to place from which Indians came here and the names changed to suit the change in the plot"; and this, you assure me, "is the one which furnishes the basis for the Book of Mormon." This is a very PRETTY "THEORY," and SOMEWHAT INGENIOUS, but WHERE IS THE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT IT? . . .

I confess myself not a little surprised that an attorney, trained in a school of justice to weigh and determine the value and admissibility of evidence, should ask a candid public to decide so grave a matter upon the bare assertion of an INTERESTED PARTY, without the SHADOW OF EVIDENCE to support it.

If "three manuscripts" ever existed, why not produce the evidence to prove it? Why not induce that library of "over one thousand books and pamphlets" to yield up some of its hidden treasures of knowledge upon this point, and settle this mooted question once for all? Mormonism for more than half a century has been demanding the production of the Manuscript Found that it might be compared with the Book of Mormon. Since the discovery of that now historic document, and the further unquestionable fact that it bears not the slightest resemblance to the Book of Mormon, the *wonderful discovery* has been made that Solomon Spalding wrote "three manuscripts!" While you affirm very dogmatically, as others have done before you, that Spalding wrote three manuscripts, yet, like your predecessors, you offer not A SINGLE FACT in support of this claim. In the face of these significant facts, you with characteristic pertinacity assert:

"If you had made any investigation worth mentioning, you would have found that the absolute identity of the very unusual names in the Book of Mormon with the second Spalding Manuscript was originally one of the principal evidences of the connection between the two."

Here we have the assumption that a "second Spalding Manuscript" actually existed, and from this assumed premise you jump to the conclusion that the names were "absolutely identical" with those in the Book of Mormon. My objections to this statement are:

1. The existence of a second manuscript is assumed, not proved.

2. If such manuscript really existed, no proof is offered to show the "absolute identity" of the names with those in the Book of Mormon.

Hence, until you establish the alleged fact that such "second Spalding Manuscript" had a bona fide existence, and that the "very unusual names" found in the Book of Mormon are "absolutely identical" with those found in the so-called "second Spalding Manuscript," a fair-minded, just public will reject this new-fangled "Spalding Manuscript theory" AS THE MEREST VAGARY OF A PREJUDICED MIND, AND WHOLLY WITHOUT THE SLIGHTEST FOUNDATION IN FACT. I do not say that the "three manuscripts" had no actual existence; but I do say that if such manuscripts ever had anything more than an imaginary existence somebody knows it; and if somebody knows it, why not have that somebody step upon the witness stand and boldly testify to the fact? But why pursue this question further, since you admit that it is only a "theory"—a theory, too, supported by such a class of evidence which, as a lawyer, you well know would BE REJECTED BY ANY COURT IN THIS BROAD LAND OF OURS. Acknowledging the fact you say:

"I can not establish these facts except by hearsay evidence, which Greenleaf would bar."

In concluding this paragraph you remark that:

"Barring the question of the hearsay character of the evidence, I believe a case can be made out much stronger than

the *circumstantial evidence* upon which many a man has been hung." (Italics mine.)

This may be true, but it must be borne in mind that many an innocent man has been hung upon purely "circumstantial evidence," and it is a principle of law from which there is no deviation that a guilty man may better escape the punishment due to his crimes than that an innocent man should suffer the extreme penalty of the law. Hence, juries are always instructed to give the prisoner the benefit of a doubt. But, of course, I need not remind an experienced attorney that there is a vast difference between "hearsay evidence" and "circumstantial evidence." The former Greenleaf peremptorily excludes.—*Journal of History*, vol. 2, p. 94.

A SPIDER'S WEB OF SUPPOSITIONS.

The extremely tenuous nature of the Spalding Romance theory in its present form is best shown by permitting it to be stated by its own proponents. Mr. Charles Shook, who was advertised just recently as the man destined to shake our work to its foundation, shall have that honor. He admits the existence of the Spalding manuscript in Oberlin College; but thinks there may have been another one enlarged and "polished" up. Hear him:

It is POSSIBLE that Spalding, in polishing and finishing his story, REWROTE IT, and that it was the story rewritten which was submitted to Patterson and which fell into Rigdon's hands; while the old manuscript MAY have been placed in a trunk, with other papers of Spalding's, which was sent, after his death, to the home of his wife's brother, W. H. Sabine, in Onondaga County, New York. Smith worked as a teamster for Sabine in 1823, and some have CLAIMED that he either copied or stole this manuscript. The first is very unreasonable, the second is POSSIBLE IF SUCH MANUSCRIPT WAS IN SABINE'S POSSESSION.—*Cumora Revisited*, by Shook, p. 28.

Grover Cleveland would call these men "ifists."

According to him the "ifist," lost in the woods without fire or food, said, "*If* we had a fire, and *if* we had some eggs, we would have ham and eggs, *if* we had the ham."

Mr. Shook argues that IF Spalding ever rewrote his manuscript, and IF he resubmitted it to the publisher, Rigdon MAY have stolen it; and IF this did not happen, Smith MAY have copied it while in the possession of Sabine, and IF he did not copy it, he MAY have stolen it, IF, last of all, SABINE EVER HAD SUCH A MANUSCRIPT.

These men have gone back to the original Christian or Campbellite proposition, "IF we have authority to preach we have authority to baptize."

We can not too heartily thank Mr. Shook for his very ingenuous statement of the case.

REQUIESCAT IN PACE.

Mr. Bays very nicely demolished this spider's web of guesses. His was the conclusion of a very close student of the subject, who certainly was not prejudiced in favor of the Book of Mormon; in fact he was eager enough to defeat the Book of Mormon, but in this instance he was more fair, or perhaps less desperate than those grave robbers who would violate the peaceful and well-earned repose of the dead and long-buried Spalding Romance theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon.

Gentlemen, it has been dead too long, and, unlike Lazarus, never having had Jesus for a friend, it can not hope for a successful reincarnation.

CHAPTER FOUR

AFFIRMATION.

It is a matter of regret that we have been obliged to speak mostly from a negative standpoint in these pages. Our message is affirmative, and we assume the negative only when forced to do so by that which we consider unfair attack.

We hold that all men should obey the laws of the land; and that the church should not attempt to dominate the state.

We believe in the sanctity of the home and that one man should have but one wife. That is the divine plan and it should not be evaded in any way. All good men and women should unite to combat the growing evils of divorce and prostitution.

We affirm that God has spoken and does still speak in this age. We affirm the divine principle of continued revelation.

You may not agree with us on that principle; but is our belief of a nature to subject us justly to ostracism and persecution?

Yet for this "evangelical churches," as they term themselves, in certain places, have refused to affiliate with us in various forms of social service, and individuals have slandered, persecuted, and misrepresented us, and that too where it is well known that our people are honest and virtuous and have no connection with Utah Mormonism. Consider the

proposition: there are thousands of people in the large cities and elsewhere who know not God. We are anxious to tell them about him. But, strange thought, we must be prevented from doing so because we tell them that God still lives, works, and speaks exactly as he did two thousand years ago, while others insist that we must content ourselves with telling them, in the language of Walter Rauschenbusch, that God "acted long ago and put it down in a book," and that is the end of the story.

We affirm that God heals the sick now, and that all of the gifts of the gospel given to the believer anciently are given now.

We affirm that the gospel has been restored again to earth and that the church has been formed again after the divine plan set forth in the New Testament, with apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and all the officers that God originally set in the church.

We affirm that the great God of heaven is an unchangeable God, and that if he is not blessing the churches now as of old, and if the same power is not with them (concerning which open confession is frequently made) the fault lies with the churches.

We affirm that Jesus lives and that he is the Savior of men, the gospel being the "power of God unto salvation." We hold that the hour of the second advent of Jesus approaches, and that these are the latter days, in which God's power is to be wonderfully displayed as the time draws near for that great, world-changing event.

We believe in the ministrations of the Holy Ghost, and hold that men may be inspired and directed by

it as of old, and that the promise is still potent, that whosoever will do the *will of God* may *know* of the doctrine.

INVITATION.

No man can get a fair understanding of Christianity by using Ingersoll's writings exclusively as textbooks. The thought is absurd. For precisely similar reasons no one can understand the message of Latter Day Saints by studying only works written by avowed enemies.

We invite you to attend the services of our people. We ask you to talk with our representatives, and ask them questions. We have nothing hidden.

One celebrated lecturer on "Mormonism," having stated his side of the question, advised the people not to listen to anything or read anything on the other side. We assume that you are neither fools nor cowards, and that you will be safe in the enjoyment of your God-given privileges to investigate and "prove all things."

We urge you to read the church books, the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants.¹ These books teach the highest and best of morals. Their precepts will make men and women better if they are obeyed. Why, then, condemn us for believing these books?

¹In this connection we refer to the Lamoni editions of Doctrine and Covenants, or other editions not containing the spurious so-called revelation on polygamy.

